

HP Docket No. 10007660-1

**REMARKS**

In order to place the application in condition for allowance, or alternately in better condition for appeal, claims 7 and 11-12 have been amended; claims 1, 4-6, and 13-23 have been canceled without prejudice; and new claims 24-31 have been added. Applicants believe that the amendment to the abovementioned claims does not require a further substantive examination and does not present new matter, and therefore request entry of this amendment. Reconsideration of the application in light of the above amendments and the following remarks is respectfully requested.

**Rejections****Rejection Under 35USC §102**

Claims 1, 4, 13-15, and 17 have been rejected under 35 USC §102(e), as being anticipated by U.S. patent 6,903,832 to Maekawa et al. ("Maekawa"). In response, claims 1, 4, 13-15, and 17 have been canceled. The rejection of these claims, therefore, is rendered moot.

**Rejection Under 35USC §103**

Claims 5-6, 16, and 18-23 have been rejected under 35 USC §103(a), as being unpatentable over 6,903,832 to Maekawa et al. ("Maekawa"). In response, claims 5-6, 16, and 18-23 have been canceled. The rejection of these claims, therefore, is rendered moot.

**Amendment of Allowed Claims**

Allowed claims 7 and 11-12 have been amended to recite a "print status" instead of a "print status page". Support for these claim amendments is found in the specification, claims, and drawings as originally filed, and no new matter has been added. More specifically, support

HP Docket No. 10007660-1

for a "print status" is found in the specification at least in the Abstract, and at p. 24, ln. 18-20. This claim amendment is not believed material to allowability, in that the reason for the indication of allowable subject matter by the Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences is that "the art of record does not teach ... executing, by a client, a set of instructions to generate a print job, as required by claims 7 & 11" (Final Office Action, p.4).

### **New Claims**

New apparatus claims 24-31 have been added. Independent claim 24 (directed to a printer) and independent claim 27 (directed to a server) each recite in apparatus form all the essential limitations of allowed method claim 11. Independent claim 30 (directed to a client) recites in apparatus form all the essential limitations of allowed method claim 7.

Support for these new claims is found in the specification, claims, and drawings as originally filed, and no new matter has been added. With regard to elements and limitations not explicitly recited in the allowed method claims, support for the communications port and the processor is found at least in the I/O Port and Microprocessor(s) of Figs. 11-14. Support for the server module, and for the server being provided in the printer, is found at least in the Printer Web Server of Fig. 12. Support for the printer and the computer being connected over a network is found at least in Fig. 7. Support for the print status being dynamically updated while the printer prints the print job, and for the print status being based upon dynamic input received from the printer, is found at least at Figs. 22A-B, elements 2216-2226.

### **Formalities**

#### **Allowable Subject Matter**

Applicants acknowledge, with appreciation, the allowance of claims 7-12.

HP Docket No. 10007660-1

Comments on Statement of Reasons for Allowance

Applicants agree with the Office's conclusion regarding patentability, without necessarily agreeing with or acquiescing in the reason(s) set forth in the Office Action. In particular, Applicants wish to emphasize that the patentability of claims stems from the respective combinations of elements defined by the claims, each viewed as a whole, rather than the presence of any particular element(s) in the combinations. Applicants submit that the indicated claims are allowable because the prior art fails to anticipate, teach, suggest, or render obvious the invention as claimed, independent of how the invention is paraphrased. Applicants thus rely on the claims, as drafted, rather than any characterization in the Office Action.

Conclusion

Attorney for Applicant(s) has reviewed each one of the cited references made of record and not relied upon, and believes that the claims presently on file in the subject application patentably distinguish thereover, either taken alone or in combination with one another.

Therefore, all claims presently on file in the subject application are in condition for immediate allowance, and such action is respectfully requested. If it is felt for any reason that direct communication with Applicant's attorney would serve to advance prosecution of this case to finality, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned Robert C. Sismilich, Esq. at the below-listed telephone number.

RECEIVED  
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

OCT 05 2009

HP Docket No. 10007660-1

**AUTHORIZATION TO PAY AND PETITION  
FOR THE ACCEPTANCE OF ANY NECESSARY FEES**

If any charges or fees must be paid in connection with the foregoing communication (including but not limited to the payment of an extension fee or issue fees), or if any overpayment is to be refunded in connection with the above-identified application, any such charges or fees, or any such overpayment, may be respectively paid out of, or into, the Deposit Account No. 08-2025 of Hewlett-Packard Company. If any such payment also requires Petition or Extension Request, please construe this authorization to pay as the necessary Petition or Request which is required to accompany the payment.

Respectfully submitted,



Robert C. Sismilich  
Reg. No. 41,314  
Attorney for Applicant  
Telephone: (941) 677-6015

Date: 10/5/09

Hewlett-Packard Company  
Intellectual Property Administration  
3404 E. Harmony Rd.  
Mail Stop 35  
Fort Collins, CO 80528-9599